Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07/05)
Approved for use through 06/30/2008. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)
030728 / BLL-0181

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on _____

Signature _____

Typed or printed name _____

Application Number	Filed
10/828,718	April 21, 2004

First Named Inventor
David A. Hill

Art Unit	Examiner
2167	Susan F. Rayyan

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).
Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

☑ attorney or agent of record.
Registration number 46673.

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____

/Marisa J. Dubuc/
Signature

Marisa J. Dubuc
Typed or printed name

860-286-2929
Telephone number

July 16, 2008
Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

☐ *Total of _ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Tradeamrk Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	David A. Hill	)
		) Group Art Unit: 2167
Serial No.:	10/828,718	)
		) Examiner: Susan F. Rayyan
Filed:	April 21, 2004	)
		) Confirmation No: 4760
For:	METHODS, SYSTEMS, AND STORAGE MEDIUMS FOR INTEGRATING SERVICE REQUEST GENERATION SYSTEMS WITH A SERVICE ORDER CONTROL SYSTEM	)))))

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

In response to the Final Office Action mailed April 30, 2008, and in conjunction with the concurrently filed Notice of Appeal, the Applicant submits the following for entry in the above-identified application.

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-18, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0074463 to Swartz et al. ("Swartz") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0061062 to Tucker. In addition, claims 9 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Swartz in view of Tucker as applied to claims 1 and 11, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,993 issued to Gabbita. The Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and submits that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 1, 10, and 11 recite, *inter alia*, "resolving any errors and inconsistencies detected from the validating resulting in a validated service request...wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes: ***converting the converted service request back to its original data format***; and transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source."

These features are neither taught, nor rendered obvious in view of Swartz and Tucker, nor by the art as a whole. The Examiner states that these features are taught by Tucker, citing primarily Figure 9, and paragraphs [0075]-[0077] in support. However, upon a review of both Swartz and Tucker, ***it appears there is not even a single instance of any "re-conversion" of service requests to their original format prior to returning the service request back to its source as part of an error resolution process***. Rather, Tucker discloses a data switch for transforming data from one language to another (Abstract; paragraphs [0045]-[0046]). The portions relied upon in the Final Office Action by the Examiner teach transformation of a transaction that is sent to a first supplier (paragraph [0076]). The ***supplier's response*** to the transaction is processed and transformed "back into the original language and syntax of the requester company" (paragraph [0076]). In context, it is clear that the alleged 'reconversion' process described in Tucker has ***nothing to do with an error resolution process***. As claimed, the reconversion of the Applicant's invention is directed to the ***originating service request*** (not a supplier response to the request) and is performed as part of an error resolution process. It appears that the Examiner has interpreted portions of the Applicant's claims in a vacuum and not as a whole to derive the rejection based upon Tucker. As neither Tucker nor Schwartz teaches,

suggests, or renders obvious this reconversion feature of the Applicant's claims, the Applicant submits that clear error exists in the outstanding rejections of claims 1, 10, and 11. For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claims 1, 10, and 11 are patentably distinct from Swartz and Tucker, both alone and in combination. Claims 2-8 depend from what should be an allowable base claim. Claims 12-18 and 20 depend from what should be an allowable base claim. For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claims 2-8, 12-18, and 20 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 19 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 11. With respect to claims 9 and 19, Gabbita does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Swartz and Tucker. For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claims 9 and 19 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is urged that the final rejection of claims 1-20 be overturned. The final rejection is in error and should be reversed. The fee set forth in 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1) is enclosed herewith. If there are any additional charges with respect to this Request, or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Marisa J. Dubuc/
Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
Customer No. 36192

Date: July 16, 2008
Address: 20 Church Street, 22nd Floor, Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115